

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending, with claim 1 being independent. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-4 and 6 recite allowable subject matter. However, in view of the comments below, applicants believe that all of the pending claims are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5, 7, and 11-15 have been rejected as allegedly being obvious over WO 93/23899 (Tidwell) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,048,044 (Ireland). Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection because Tidwell fails to describe or suggest a reflector surrounding a laser-active solid body at a distance from the lateral surface of the solid body for reflecting light that exits the solid body back towards the solid body to thereby form an annular gap between the solid body and the reflector, as recited in claim 1, and because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Tidwell in the manner suggested.

Tidwell relates to a laser system 2 having a solid state lasing medium 4 that receives pump radiation from a pump source 10 through an end surface 6 of the medium 4. See Tidwell at page 4, lines 11-19, and Fig. 1. The solid state lasing medium 4 has a circumferential side surface 8 that reflects the pump radiation by total internal reflection. See Tidwell at page 4, lines 11-27 and Fig. 1. A reflecting coating can be applied to the side surface 8 to support this reflection. See Tidwell at page 4, lines 28 -35 and Fig. 1. The reflective coating can be specular or diffusive and the side surface 8 can be treated to provide a rough surface to reflect radiation. See Tidwell at page 5, lines 1-14. However, while light can pass through Tidwell's side surface 8, there is no suggestion that the coating surrounding Tidwell's side surface 8 is at a distance from the side surface 8 to form an annular gap between the side surface 8 and the coating. Rather, as Tidwell explains, the "reflective coating is applied to the side surface 8." See Tidwell at page 5, line 1.

In view of the deficiency in Tidwell, the Office cites Ireland and argues that "Ireland teaches a pumped solid state medium wherein a diffusive reflective surface is spaced from the solid state body (fig. 13) forming a gap" such that it "would have been obvious ... to combine

the diffusive reflective surface of Tidwell with the spaced apart diffusive reflective surface of Ireland in order to form a gap to allow for insertion of a cooling medium," as supposedly suggested at col. 6, lines 56-60 of Ireland. Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

First, Ireland does not describe or suggest a "diffusive reflective surface" that is spaced from a solid body. In particular, although a reflective diffraction grating 96 is spaced from a laser member 90, the diffraction grating 96 is not a reflector that includes a surface for diffusing light, as recited in claim 1. Rather, as Ireland explains, light reflected from the diffraction grating 96 is reflected at an angle that fulfills the condition of total internal reflection at the inner surface of the laser member 90 and the reflected light from the grating 96 "travels in a direction having a substantial component along the optical axis." See Ireland at col. 7, lines 1-51.

Second, one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify Tidwell with the diffraction grating design of Ireland because any such modification would render Tidwell's laser system 2 inoperable, which requires that pump radiation be input into the lasing medium 4 through the end surface 6. In Ireland, by contrast, the pumping light enters the side surface 94 of the laser member 90 such that the light is in a "direction normal to the optical axis." See Ireland at col. 7, lines 38-51.

Third, any modification of Tidwell's laser system 2 to include a reflective diffraction grating spaced from the side surface 8 would change the principle of operation of Tidwell, which explains that the reflective coating is diffusive to provide for a greater number of path lengths of the pumping radiation that is reflected back and forth within the lasing medium 4. See Tidwell at page 5, lines 1-6. Even if one were to somehow place the reflective diffraction grating at a distance from Tidwell's lasing medium 4 to form a gap between the reflective diffraction grating and the lasing medium 4, such a placement would not provide for a greater number of path lengths.

Fourth, Ireland teaches away from such a modification of Tidwell at col. 7, lines 51-61. As Ireland explains in this passage, in the only design in which the pumping light travels in a direction having a substantial component along the optical axis, "no special arrangement is

needed for reflecting the pumping light after the initial pass" because the pumping light "will undergo total internal reflection at the end of the initial pass" in such a design. The "special arrangement" to which Ireland refers is arranging the reflective diffraction grating 96 at a distance from the laser member 90. Moreover, even though Ireland mentions in this passage that pumping light can have a substantial component along an optical axis, Ireland never suggests that such pumping light would enter the laser member 90 at an end surface, as in Tidwell's laser system 2. Rather, Ireland explains that to obtain a substantial component along the optical axis, an optical device is positioned between the laser diodes and the (lateral surface 94) of the laser member 90. See Ireland at col. 7, lines 51-57.

For these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Tidwell and Ireland. Claims 5, 7, and 11-15 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 8-10 have been rejected as allegedly being obvious over Tidwell in view of Ireland and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118718 (Honea). Claims 8-10 depend from claim 1, which was rejected as being obvious over Tidwell in view of Ireland. As discussed above, Tidwell fails to describe or suggest a reflector surrounding a laser-active solid body at a distance from the lateral surface of the solid body for reflecting light that exits the solid body back towards the solid body to thereby form an annular gap between the solid body and the reflector, as recited in claim 1. While Honea may describe the use of a high refractive index medium, it does not remedy the failure of Tidwell to describe or suggest this subject matter. In Honea, the multi-layer coating around a side of a laser slab 22 is not located at a distance from the side of the laser slab 22 in such a manner as to form an annular gap between the laser slab 22 and the multi-layer coating. Rather, the multi-layer coating is applied directly to one or more sides of the laser slab. See Honea at paragraph 0027 and Fig. 5. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over any possible combination of Tidwell, Ireland, and Honea, and claims 8-10 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

At Page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claim 2 is allowable because "an end pumped laser apparatus having a diffusive lateral surface and a spaced apart annular reflector was not found to be taught in the prior art," that the combination of Tidwell and Ireland were "not found to teach or motivate an end pumped laser to have both the lateral surface and the reflector be diffusive," and that no references taught the lateral surface to be diffusive and a spaced apart reflector to be present." Applicants agree that claim 2 is allowable. For purposes of clarity, however, applicants note that claim 2 recites that the "surface for diffusing light is the lateral surface" and there is nothing in claim 2 that would indicate that both the lateral surface and the reflector are diffusive. Moreover, applicants do not concede that the stated reasons for allowable subject matter are the only grounds for patentability of the allowable claims, that the limitations excluded from the reasons for allowable subject matter are taught or suggested by the art of record, or that all of the limitations are necessary for patentability of the allowable claims or other claims directed to the disclosed subject matter.

Applicant : Malte Kumkar et al.
Serial No. : 10/765,051
Filed : January 28, 2004
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 15540-020US1 / 25 216 RK/nu;
Trumpf 18.00201, DS07549

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this filing. Nevertheless, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 15540-020US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2007

/Diana DiBerardino/

Diana DiBerardino

Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40404431